



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/917,026	07/26/2001	Gowri Rajaram	UTL 00113	7642	
75	90 06/14/2006		EXAMINER		
Kyocera Wireless Corp.			TORRES, MARCOS L		
Attn: Patent Department 10300 Campus Point Drive		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
San Diego, CA 92121			2617	<u>-</u>	
			DATE MAILED: 06/14/200	DATE MAILED: 06/14/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/917,026	RAJARAM, GOWRI	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Marcos L. Torres	2617	
Period for	- Th MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespond nc address	
WHICH - Extens after S - If NO p - Failure Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DASIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Deriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing a patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONED	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)⊠ ⁻ 3)□ \$	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 Ma</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowan	action is non-final. ce except for formal matters, pro		
Dispositio	on of Claims			
5) _ 6) _ 6) _ 7) _ 6	Claim(s) 39-52 is/are pending in the application (a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 39-52 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	n from consideration.		
Applicatio	on Papers			
10)□ T	the specification is objected to by the Examiner the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the consequence of the confection of the confe	epted or b) objected to by the E Irawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority ur	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) [cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents Copies of the priority documents Copies of the certified copies of the priority Application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage	
Attachment(s	s) of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗖 Intention Summer	PTO 443)	
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔲 Informa	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4)	e	

Art Unit: 2617

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 39-52 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 4. Claims 39-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison US006449476B1 in view of Kuroda US006457174B1.

As to claim 39, Hutchison disclose a method for updating system software in a wireless communications device (see col. 1, lines 8-11), the method comprising: providing a patch manager to manage system software updates (see col. 5, lines 62-65); storing the system software update on a nonvolatile memory module comprising a file system section, a patch manager run time instruction (PMRTI) section (see fig. 1,

item 115, 101), a code storage section, and patch manager code section (see col. 4, line 66 – col. 5 line 10), also is noted that the claim does not specify the difference if any between these storage section, (for example the difference between a code storage section and patch manager code section) for examining purposes they are the same; forming the system software into a plurality of symbol libraries, comprising a first symbol library, a second symbol library, and a third symbol library, wherein each symbol library comprises a plurality of symbols having a related functionality (see col. 5, lines 2-10); and arranging the first symbol library, the second symbol library, and the third symbol library in at least two code sections, wherein the second symbol library and the third symbol library are arranged contiguously within a single code section on the non volatile memory module (see col. 5, lines 11-61), again is noted that the claim does not specify any difference between each symbol library other than second and third share the same code section; updating a code section address table which stores a code section location reference for each of the at least two code sections (see fig. 4, item 174-180). Hutchinson does not specifically disclose updating a symbol offset address table which stores an offset reference and a code section address table reference for each of the first, second and third symbol libraries.

In an analogous art, Kuroda discloses the method of updating a symbol offset address table which stores an offset reference and a code section address table reference for each of the first, second and third symbol libraries (see abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Application/Control Number: 09/917,026

Art Unit: 2617

the invention to add this technique to the Hutchison method for better management of the memory resources.

As to claim 40, Hutchinson disclose the method further comprising executing the system software update from the nonvolatile memory, loading the system software update from the patch manager code section and the code storage section within the nonvolatile memory module to a memory component and performing at least one requested action (see col. 5, lines 11-65).

As to claims 41 and 43-44, Hutchinson disclose the method wherein forming the system software into the plurality of symbol libraries, further comprises forming a symbol access code and arranging the symbol access code in the corresponding symbol library (see col. 5, lines 11-61), since the claim does specify the difference between a symbol library and symbol access code, for examining purposes they are the same.

As to claim 42, Hutchinson disclose the method further comprises referencing the symbol access code to calculate an address of a sought symbol, comprising accessing a code section address table and a symbol address table to determine a corresponding code section address table reference and accessing the code section address table to determine a corresponding code section location reference associated with the corresponding code section address table reference (see col. 6, lines 9-21). Hutchinson does not specifically disclose using an offset address table. In an analogous art, Kuroda discloses a symbol offset address table (see abstract).

Regarding claim 45 is the corresponding apparatus claim of method claim 39.

Therefore claim 45 is rejected for the same reasons shown above.

As to claims 47-49, Hutchinson discloses the wireless communication device of claim 45, wherein the memory component is located on the nonvolatile memory and a volatile memory (see fig. 1, item 114, 120).

As to claims 50-51, Hutchinson discloses the wireless communication device wherein each code section stores a system software update (see col. 5, lines 11-61).

As to claims 46 and 52, Hutchinson discloses the wireless communication device wherein the patch manager code section is configured to control the system software updates that are downloaded (see col. 9, lines 7-30).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2617

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be mailed to:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Commissioner of Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

571-273-8300

for formal communication intended for entry, informal communication or draft communication; in the case of informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marcos L. Torres whose telephone number is 571-272-7926. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-6:00 PM alt. Wednesday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-252-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/917,026 Page 7

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Marcos L Torres Examiner Art Unit 2617

mit

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER